

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CHRISTOPHER A. JONES,

Plaintiff,

v.

DWIGHT NEVEN, et al.,

Defendant.

2:07-CV-1088 JCM (GWF)

Date: N/A

Time: N/A

ORDER

Presently before the court is *pro se* plaintiff Christopher A. Jones' motion for district judge to reconsider magistrate judge's order. (Doc. #224). Defendants filed a response. (Doc. #225). Plaintiff then filed a "supplement" to his motion. (Doc. #226).

In the instant motion, plaintiff moves the court to reconsider Magistrate Judge Foley's order on the sufficiency of defendants' answers. (Doc. #209). Plaintiff objects to the magistrate judge's findings, arguing that many of defendants' answers are insufficient. (Doc. #224).

When reviewing the magistrate judge's order, this court determines whether it is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(a); Local Rule IB 3-1. The magistrate judge's order is "clearly erroneous" if this court is left with "a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." *See United States v. U.S. Gypsum Co.*, 333 U.S. 364, 395 (1948); *Burdick v. Comm'r IRS*, 979 F.2d 1369, 1370 (9th Cir. 1992). However, "[w]hen reviewing discovery disputes . . . the [m]agistrate is afforded broad discretion, which will be overruled only if abused." *Tafas v. Dudas*, 530 F. Supp. 2d 786, 792 (E.D. Va. 2008).

1 After reviewing the moving papers and defendants' answers, the court is not left with "a
2 definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." *U.S. Gypsum Co.*, 333 U.S. at 395.
3 The magistrate judge has not abused his "broad discretion," and the court declines to overturn the
4 magistrate judge's order. *See Tafas*, 530 F. Supp. 2d at 792.

5 Accordingly,

6 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiff Christopher A.
7 Jones' motion for district judge to reconsider magistrate judge's order (doc. #224) be, and the same
8 hereby is, DENIED.

9 DATED this 31st day of October, 2011.

10
11 
12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**